



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/445,710	03/13/2000	HANNU JUHANI LEINO	32107	1287

116 7590 03/20/2002

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE EAST
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1484

EXAMINER

ALVO, MARC S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1731

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2002

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/445,710	LEINO ET AL.	
Period for Reply	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steve Alvo	1731	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
Status			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 March 2001</u> .			
2a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL . 2b) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.			
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of:			
1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.			
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).			
Attachment(s)			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.	
16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.		20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.	

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/445,710	LEINO ET AL.
	Examiner Steve Alvo	Art Unit 1731

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steve Alvo. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Bargmeyer. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 15 March 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner called to find out if a further response was being filed. Mr. Bargmeyer indicated that the 3-6-2000 preliminary amendment was the only response to be filed and the suspension was to be terminated.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

In response to the preliminary amendment filed March 6, 2002 and telephone conversation with Applicant's attorney, Mr. Bargmeyer, the suspension is terminated. Mr. Bargmeyer indicated that a further response would not be filed

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over OSTBERG et al ("Use of Carbon Dioxide In the Production of Sulphate Pulp").

See page 515, first paragraph for adding alkali, e.g. sodium hydroxide, to the pulp to adjust the temperature in combination with carbon dioxide to buffer the pH to a pH of 8.0. See page 512, second paragraph for treating bleached or unbleached sulphate pulp. See page 509, middle of page for "CO₂ gas" dissolved. If the charge of alkali is not an aqueous solution of sodium hydroxide then such would have been obvious as aqueous solutions of sodium hydroxide are commonly used in the treatment of pulp to raise the pH. The term "intended to contain calcium carbonate filler" in claim 8, is not a positive limitation.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OSTBERG et al in view of G.B. Patent 815,527.

OSTBERG et al teaches adding alkali and carbon dioxide to counter each other's pH changing effect. See page 515, first paragraph for adding alkali, e.g. sodium hydroxide, to the pulp to adjust the temperature in combination with carbon dioxide to buffer the pH to a pH of 8.0. See page 512, second paragraph for treating bleached or unbleached sulphate pulp. See page 509, middle of page for "CO₂ gas" dissolved. It would have been obvious to that the alkali of OSTBERG et al could have been an aqueous solution of sodium hydroxide as such is taught by G.B. Patent 815,527. G.B. Patent 815,527 further teaches that the sodium hydroxide could be added prior to the carbon dioxide (page 2, lines 35-41). The term "intended to contain calcium carbonate filler" in claim 8, is not a positive limitation. Claim 9 is rejected as the use of pipes to add chemicals is well known in the papermaking art.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OSTBERG et al with or without G.B. Patent 815,527 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ADMITTED PRIOR ART (specification, page 1, lines 6-11).

The ADMITTED PRIOR ART teaches that it is known to neutralize (pH 7-8.5) the pulp before adding calcium carbonate as a filler. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the neutralized pulp of OSTBERG et al and/or G.B. Patent 815,527 could have the calcium carbonate of the ADMITTED PRIOR ART added to it as it is at the proper pH for calcium carbonate filler.

The argument that OSTBERG et al does not teach adding CO₂ in combination with alkali metal hydroxide is not convincing as OSTBERG et al teaches (pages 512-513) adding both CO₂ and sodium hydroxide (charge of alkali). Such addition of sodium hydroxide and CO₂ reads on the claimed "adding thereto a combination of an alkali metal hydroxide feed and a carbon

dioxide feed". The claimed feeds of (1) CO₂ and (2) alkali metal hydroxide do not define over the combination of feeds claimed by Applicant.

The argument that OSTBERG et al does not control the pH throughout the paper making is not convincing. The term "paper making" has not been defined. OSTBERG et al teaches buffering the various points in the paper making process. The instant "papermaking" reads on any of the paper making stages of OSTBERG et al. The instant paper making does not include all paper making stages, e.g. chipping wood into chips, and can read on any single paper making stage.

The argument that the present invention adds alkali metal hydroxide and a carbon dioxide regardless of the pulp suspension's initial pH is not convincing as the claimed pH does not differ from the pH of OSTBERG et al. For example, claim 2 calls for adjusting the pH to a pH of 7 to 9. The buffering pH of 8 disclosed by OSTBERG et al is within the claimed 7 to 9. Applicant has not claimed or disclosed an initial pH that differs from the initial pH of OSTBERG et al.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

When filing an "**Official**" FAX in Group 1730, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "**Official**" for papers that are to be entered into the file. The "**Official**" FAX phone numbers for this TC 1700 are:

Non-Final Fax: (703) 872-9310
After-Final FAX: (703) 872-9311

When filing an "**Unofficial**" FAX in Group 1730, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "**Unofficial**" for Draft Documents and other Communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers. The "**Unofficial**" FAX phone number for this Art Unit (1731) is (703) 305-7115.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the **primary examiner** should be directed to **Steve Alvo** whose telephone number is (703) 308-2048. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:00 AM - 2:30 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Stanley Silverman, can be reached on 703-308-3837.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Group receptionist** whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

The Customer Services Center for Technology Center 1700 (703-306-5665) shall provide the following service assistance to external and internal customers in the areas listed below.

Services provided:

Patent Application Filing Receipts
Missing References
Information regarding When Action can be Expected
Lost/Misplaced/Requested Application retrieval
Retrieval from PTO Publication Branch

Retrieval from non-Publication Branch
Status Queries (written or oral)
Paper Matching Queries
Certificates of Correction.
Printer Waiting

The Customer Service Office, TC 1700, is located in CP3-8-D13, and is open to receive requests for service in person, by phone **(703) 306-5665**, or E-mail "Customer Service 1700" from 8:30 am-5:00 pm each business day. The Customer Services Center is part of the Special Programs Office of TC 1700 and will be staffed by the Technical Information Specialists who will serve as Customer Service Representatives (CSR):

Carolyn E. Johnson, Marshall Gaddis, Bessie Bowie, Lucy Jones.

MSA
3/18/02



STEVE ALVO
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1731